



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/072,114

02/05/2002

Dan Kikinis

007287.00034

4131

22907 7590 12/21/2010

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

1100 13th STREET, N.W.

SUITE 1200

WASHINGTON, DC 20005-4051

EXAMINER

MARANDI, JAMES R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2421

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/21/2010

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/072,114	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KIKINIS ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> JAMES R. MARANDI	<b>Art Unit</b> 2421	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 September 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 17, 31 and 52-72 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 17, 31 and 52-72 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 9/27/2010 has been entered.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

2. The information disclosure statements (IDS) submitted on 6/08/2010 and 11/09/2010 were filed after the mailing date of the final office action on 5/25/2010. In view of the Continued Examination request of 9/27/2010, the submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is eligible for consideration by the examiner.

***Response to Amendment***

3. This action is in response to applicant's amendment filed on 9/27/2010. Claims 1, 17, 31 and 52- 72 are presently pending. Claims 2-16, 18- 30, and 32- 51 have been cancelled. Claims 65- 72 are newly presented.

***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments filed on 9/27/2010 have been fully considered. As to rejection of claims 57 and 60 under 35 U.S.C § 112, first paragraph, applicant's arguments are persuasive, and said rejection is hereby withdrawn. However, arguments with respect to claims 1, 17, 31 and 52- 72 as to rejections under 35 U.S.C § 103 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Examiner has deployed a new ground of rejection, based on discovery of even more pertinent prior art. This does not mean that the applicant overcome the prior art of record with respect to Oosterhout and Cove.

- 4.1. For example, with respect to claim 1, applicant argues that “***Oosterhout uses only fixed sub images (i.e. snapshots), it does not teach or suggest capturing a***

***video stream, converting a video stream into reduced resolution thumbnails  
video stream, or displaying a reduced resolution thumbnail video stream***". Page  
10 of Remarks, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph

Examiner disagrees. Oosterhout shows in Fig. 1 receiving multiple MPEG streams. Though Fig. 1 represent such streams at the headend along with a mosaic signal, Oosterhout discloses that such mosaic signal may be formed at the receiver (Col. 5, lines 24- 36). Furthermore, in Col. 2, lines 5-6, Oosterhout has incorporated by reference International Patent Application WO 95/28794 (copy of which is provided herewith for applicant's convenience). WO 95/28794 presents several embodiments of creating a mosaic signal, including Fig. 4 where low resolution images are disclosed. Furthermore, the thumbnails of Oosterhout are not necessarily just still images. Oosterhout discloses (Col. 1, lines 64-67) that such images are refreshed (real time, no refresh means still picture, whereas depending on refresh rate a lower resolution is provided).

4.2. As to Cove, the reference teaches the motivation and evidence that it was well known at the time of invention to use a multidimensional user interface, such as applicant's claimed polyhedron. As to combination of Oosterhout and Cove, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that

Art Unit: 2421

the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). As described above, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the system of Oosterhout (a two dimensional EPG menu comprising reduced images of possible selections/ channels) with Cove's invention (showing an EPG/ Menu in three dimensional Polyhedron form, each side showing a selectable item, such as what is shown in Fig. 6, whereby the invention of Oosterhout, showing a reduced-image of the program is maintained) in order to enable the viewer to conveniently follow/monitor/navigate through multiple programs at the same time (as taught by Oosterhout Col. 1, lines 31-35, and Cove Col.1, lines 39-55).

4.3. As to Toklu, the reference was used specifically to teach what was not taught by Oosterhout and Cove, and that was detection of scene changes and changes based on image properties such as brightness, etc.

***Claim Renumbering, Rule § 1.126***

5. There is a typographical error in the numbering of claims leading to two claim 68s. As per MPEP, Rule § 1.126, claims 68 (duplicate) has been renumbered as claim 69.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

- 6.1. Claims 65, 66, 68, and 69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

- 6.1.1. Claims 65, and 68 recite the newly added limitation ***displaying plurality of graphical representations of polyhedrons in the individual image areas of the electronic program guide***, which has not been previously disclosed by the

applicant. Applicant's disclosure appears to have been limited to only one representation of the polyhedron and nowhere a plurality of polyhedrons has been disclosed.

6.1.2. Claims 66, and 69 depend on claims 65 and 68 respectively and are so rejected.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

7. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

7.1. Claims 31, 64, 71, and 72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

With respect to claim 31, applicant recites "computer-readable media storing computer-executable instructions". Said computer-readable media covers forms of non-transitory tangible media and transitory propagating signals. Furthermore, the specification does not preclude "transitory propagating signals".

The United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) is obliged to give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification



during proceedings before the USPTO. *See In re Zeltz*, 893 F.2d 319 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The broadest reasonable interpretation of a claim drawn to computer readable medium typically covers forms of non-transitory tangible media and transitory propagating signals *per se* in view of the ordinary and customary meaning of computer readable media, particularly when the specification is silent. *See* MPEP 2111.01.

A claim drawn to such a computer readable medium that covers both transitory and non-transitory embodiments may be amended to narrow the claim to cover only statutory embodiment to avoid a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 by adding the limitation “non-transitory” to the claim. *Cf. Animals- Patentability*, 1077 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 24 (April 21, 1987). Such an amendment would typically not raise the issue of new matter, even when the specification is silent because the broadest reasonable interpretation relies on the ordinary and customary meaning that includes signals *per se*. See Director Kappos’ January 26<sup>th</sup>, 2010 memo.

7.1.1. Claims 64, 71, and 72 depends on Claim 31 are rejected by the same analysis.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1, 17, 31, 53, and 55-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Florin et al., USPN 5,583,560 (hereinafter "Florin") in view of Freach et al., USPN 6,710,788 (hereinafter "Freach").

**9.1. Regarding claim 1, Florin discloses a method (Abstract) comprising:**

**providing a plurality of individual image areas in an electronic program guide (EPG) display** (User interfaces shown in Fig. 28, image area 365 along with a menu/ program selection areas 360 and 315, Col. 18, lines 47-63; the user is enabled to select multiple programs for presentation as shown in Figs. 33- 35; Col. 20 lines 20- 67. The user is enabled to have multiple views of the EPG. Starting from a view as in Fig. 28 and selecting programs to be shown as in Fig. 33 with multiple images for simultaneous viewing of several programs);

**receiving a plurality of video streams corresponding to video programming channels** (Fig. 1, Service provider 50)

**detecting a first video stream corresponding to a first selected video programming channel** (selections via 60, through 54 modules 62/ 66, as implemented through tuner 67 and switch 69 of module 54 and of Fig. 2; as detected by the tuner, See Col. 8, line 19 through Col. 10 line 32);

**capturing a first portion of the first video stream** (the video stream is captured and presented as shown in Fig. 28, 365. Multiple selections/ channels are shown in Fig. 33, showing multiple captured streams as displayed on screen. Upon selection of a channel, the stream is detected and decoded in real time and fed to the EPG, as such at time of selection, the start of the detected stream is the first portion of the video stream);

**converting the first snapshot captured portion of the first video stream into a first reduced resolution thumbnail video stream** (Fig. 33, 380, which is a grab capture of predetermined number of frames as disclosed in Col. 20, lines 20- 67 );

**displaying a graphical representation** of multiple channels in **the individual image area** (as in Fig. 33); **and**

**displaying the first reduced resolution thumbnail video stream in the first of the individual image areas** (as described above for Fig. 33).

Florin discloses a two dimensional electronic user interface in Fig. 33 where multiple videos (applications) are presented to the viewer. Florin is silent on:

**displaying a graphical representation of a polyhedron,**  
displaying the reduced image **on a side of the graphical representation**  
**of the polyhedron**

However, Freach discloses an electronic user interface, where the user is enabled to convert a two dimensional user interface to multi-dimensions by:

**displaying a graphical representation of a polyhedron**(Figs. 2, 44),  
displaying the reduced image (application) **on a side of the graphical**  
**representation of the polyhedron** (Fig. 2, Application window A is mapped to the side of the Polyhedron). Col. 4, lines 10-59

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the system of Florin with Freach's invention in order to enable the viewer to conveniently follow/monitor/navigate through multiple programs at the same time.

9.1.1. Regarding claim 53, the system of Florin and Freach discloses **displaying**  
**the graphical representation of the polyhedron comprises rendering a**

**plurality of reduced resolution thumbnail video streams on different sides of the polyhedron** (As shown in Fig. 2 of Freach, different sides of the polyhedron 44 render different applications A,B,C which are the disclosed video streams of Florin) **Wherein each of the plurality of reduced resolution thumbnail video streams corresponds to a different channel** (as tuned by the tuner of Florin), **and wherein the different sides of the polyhedron are rendered on different portions of the electronic programming guide (EPG) display, the different portions being simultaneously visible and having different sizes and shapes in the electronic programming guide (EPG) display** (As shown in Fig. 2, polyhedron 44 depicts the program channels as disclosed by Florin, while various area of the EPG (display 40 of Florin) may show other components/programs.

**9.1.2.** Regarding claim 56, the system of Florin and Freach discloses **wherein each side of the polyhedron corresponds to a different video channel having a different video stream** (as analyzed for claims 1, and 53; The sides A,B,C of Freach's Fig. 2 are mapped with the video application of Florin) , **the method further comprising:**

**receiving a user command to rotate the graphical representation of the polyhedron** (as shown in Freach's Fig. 6, the polyhedron is rotated on command; Col. 5, line 38 through Col. 6, line 13); **and**

**updating the EPG display by rotating the graphical representation of the polyhedron so that one of the different selected channels is displayed in the first of the individual image areas** (which in turn updates representation of the polyhedron in Fig. 2 and all are updated. For example, side 46b of the polyhedron will be rendered with program D as in Fig. 6b, showing the rotation from left to right from Fig. 6a).

9.1.2.1. Regarding claim 57, the system of Florin and Freach discloses

**wherein each of the different video channels corresponding to the different sides of the polyhedron is a video channel selected by a user for displaying on the polyhedron, and wherein the video channels selected for displaying on the polyhedron are a subset of a larger number of video channels available to the user via the electronic programming guide** (Florin's Fig. 33 shows channels selected by the user, e.g. user's favorites, to be shown simultaneously from the universe of channels available on the EPG; See Col.20, lines 55- 62. This user interface is mapped to Freach's polyhedron representation as analyzed for claim 1).

9.1.2.2. Regarding claim 58, the system of Florin and Freach discloses

**wherein each of the different video channels corresponding to the different sides of the polyhedron is a preselected video channel selected by a head-end administrator of the electronic**

**programming guide** (Florin's Fig. 33 is also enabled to show a category of programs preselected by the provider; Col. 20, lines 28- 31 and lines 51- 55. This user interface is mapped to Freach's polyhedron representation as analyzed for claim 1).

9.1.3. Regarding claim 62, the system of Florin and Freach discloses:

**receiving a user command to perform at least one of moving the graphical representation of the polyhedron and resizing the graphical representation of the polyhedron** (as shown in Freach: Fig. 4, the polyhedron can be moved to different areas of the workspace/ EPG; Col. 5, lines 19- 37); **and**

**updating the EPG display in response to the user command** (any such movements will update the EPG display with the new coordinate information), **the updating comprising at least one of:**

**moving the graphical representation of the polyhedron to a different one of the individual image areas** (Freach: Fig. 4,

as analyzed above) **in the display of the electronic programming guide, and**

**changing the size of the graphical representation of the polyhedron within the display of the electronic programming guide** (Freach further teaches that the size of the Polyhedron may be changed/ customized as shown in Fig. 7d, 72; Col. 6 line 32 through Col. 7, line10) .

**9.2.** Regarding claim 17, Florin discloses **an apparatus** (Abstract, Figs. 1 and 2) **comprising:**

**a tuner configured to tune to a selected channel and to receive a video stream** (Fig. 2, tuner 67, receiving video streams from 52); **and**

**an electronic programming guide component** (main module 62, producing EPG as shown in Fig. 28) **configured to:**

**display an electronic programming guide (EPG) comprising a plurality of individual image areas** (User interfaces shown in Fig. 28, image area 365 along with a menu/ program selection areas 360 and 315, Col. 18, lines 47- 63; the user is enabled to select multiple programs for presentation as shown in Figs. 33- 35; Col. 20 lines 20- 67. The user is enabled to have multiple views of the EPG. Starting from a view as in Fig. 28 and selecting programs to be shown as in Fig. 33 with multiple images for simultaneous viewing of several programs);



**receive a plurality of video streams corresponding to video programming channels** (Fig. 1, Service provider 50)

**detect a first video stream corresponding to a first selected video programming channel** (selections via 60, through 54 modules 62/ 66, as implemented through tuner 67 and switch 69 of module 54 and of Fig. 2; as detected by the tuner, See Col. 8, line 19 through Col. 10 line 32);

**capture a first portion of the first video stream** (the video stream is captured and presented as shown in Fig. 28, 365. Multiple selections/ channels are shown in Fig. 33, showing multiple captured streams as displayed on screen. Upon selection of a channel, the stream is detected and decoded in real time and fed to the EPG, as such at time of selection, the start of the detected stream is the first portion of the video stream.);

**convert the first captured portion of the first video stream into a first reduced resolution thumbnail video stream** (Fig. 33, 380, which is a grab capture of predetermined number of frames as disclosed in Col. 20, lines 20- 67);

**display a graphical representation** of multiple channels in **the individual image area** (as in Fig. 33); **and**

**display the first reduced resolution thumbnail video stream in the first of the individual image areas** (as described above for Fig. 33).

Florin discloses a two dimensional electronic user interface in Fig. 33 where multiple videos (applications) are presented to the viewer. Florin is silent on:

**displaying a graphical representation of a polyhedron,**  
displaying the reduced image **on a side of the graphical representation**  
**of the polyhedron**

However, Freach discloses an electronic user interface, where the user is enabled to convert a two dimensional user interface to multi-dimensions by:

**displaying a graphical representation of a polyhedron**(Figs. 2, 44),  
displaying the reduced image (application) **on a side of the graphical representation of the polyhedron** (Fig. 2, Application window A is mapped to the side of the Polyhedron). Col. 4, lines 10-59

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the system of Florin with Freach's invention in order to enable the viewer to conveniently follow/monitor/navigate through multiple programs at the same time.

9.2.1. Regarding claim 55, the system of Florin and Freach discloses **displaying the graphical representation of the polyhedron comprises rendering a plurality of reduced resolution thumbnail video streams on different sides of the polyhedron** (As shown in Fig. 2 of Freach, different sides of the polyhedron 44 render different applications A,B,C which are the

disclosed video streams of Florin) **Wherein each of the plurality of reduced resolution thumbnail video streams corresponds to a different channel** (as tuned by the tuner of Florin), **and wherein the different sides of the polyhedron are rendered on different portions of the electronic programming guide (EPG) display, the different portions being simultaneously visible and having different sizes and shapes in the electronic programming guide (EPG) display** (As shown in Fig. 2, polyhedron 44 depicts the program channels as disclosed by Florin, while various area of the EPG (display 40 of Florin) may show other components/ programs.

**9.2.2.** Regarding claim 59, the system of Florin and Freach discloses **wherein each side of the polyhedron corresponds to a different video channel having a different video stream** (as analyzed for claims 17, and 55; The sides A,B,C of Freach's Fig. 2 are mapped with the video application of Florin) , **the method further comprising:**

**receiving a user command to rotate the graphical representation of the polyhedron** (as shown in Freach's Fig. 6, the polyhedron is rotated on command; Col. 5, line 38 through Col. 6, line 13); **and**  
**updating the EPG display by rotating the graphical representation of the polyhedron so that one of the different selected**

**channels is displayed in the first of the individual image areas** (which in turn updates representation of the polyhedron in Fig. 2 and all are updated. For example, side 46b of the polyhedron will be rendered with program D as in Fig. 6b, showing the rotation from left to right from Fig. 6a).

9.2.2.1. Regarding claim 60, the system of Florin and Freach discloses

**wherein each of the different video channels corresponding to the different sides of the polyhedron is a video channel selected by a user for displaying on the polyhedron, and wherein the video channels selected for displaying on the polyhedron are a subset of a larger number of video channels available to the user via the electronic programming guide** (Florin's Fig. 33 shows channels selected by the user, e.g. user's favorites, to be shown simultaneously from the universe of channels available on the EPG; See Col.20, lines 55- 62. This user interface is mapped to Freach's polyhedron representation as analyzed for claim 17).

9.2.2.2. Regarding claim 61, the system of Florin and Freach discloses

**wherein each of the different video channels corresponding to the different sides of the polyhedron is a preselected video channel selected by a head-end administrator of the electronic**

**programming guide** (Florin's Fig. 33 is also enabled to show a category of programs preselected by the provider; Col. 20, lines 28- 31 and lines 51- 55. This user interface is mapped to Freach's polyhedron representation as analyzed for claim 17).

9.2.3. Regarding claim 63, the system of Florin and Freach discloses:

**receiving a user command to perform at least one of moving the graphical representation of the polyhedron and resizing the graphical representation of the polyhedron** (as shown in Freach: Fig. 4, the polyhedron can be moved to different areas of the workspace/ EPG; Col. 5, lines 19- 37); **and**

**updating the EPG display in response to the user command** (any such movements will update the EPG display with the new coordinate information), **the updating comprising at least one of:**

**moving the graphical representation of the polyhedron to a different one of the individual image areas** (Freach: Fig. 4, as analyzed above) **in the display of the electronic programming guide, and**

**changing the size of the graphical representation of the polyhedron within the display of the electronic programming guide** (Freach further teaches that the size of the Polyhedron my

be changed/ customized as shown in Fig. 7d, 72; Col. 6 line 32  
through Col. 7, line10) .

9.3. Computer code claim 31 effectuating the method of claim 1 is rejected for by the  
same analysis as claim 1.

9.3.1. Computer code claim 64 effectuating the method of claim 62 is rejected for  
by the same analysis as claim 62.

10. Claims 52, and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over  
Florin in view of Freach, in further view of Toklu et al., USPN 6,549,643 (hereinafter  
"Toklu").

10.1. Regarding claim 52, the system of Florin and Freach is silent on  
**capturing the first portion of the first video stream comprises detecting a  
scene change in the first video stream.**

However, Toklu discloses a key frame (snapshot) selection based on scene change detection (Col. 3, lines 10-16). Also see Shahraray's reference Abstract, Fig. 3 (cited by Toklu) copy of which were made of record in previous office action.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the system of Florin and Freach with Toklu's invention (selecting snapshots based on scene changes in video stream) in order to select the best/ most appropriate snapshot to balance image quality with available resources (see also Toklu's abstract, 1st five lines).

10.2. Regarding claim 54, the system of Oosterhout and Cove is silent on **a scene change detector configured to detect a scene change in the first video stream, wherein the electronic programming guide component is configured to capture the first portion of the first video stream based on a scene change detected in the first video stream.**

However, Toklu discloses a key frame (snapshot) selection based on scene change detection (Col. 3, lines 10-16). Also see Shahraray's reference Abstract, Fig. 3 (cited by Toklu) copy of which is also made of record and provided for applicant's convenience.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the system of Florin and Freach with Toklu's invention (incorporating a scene change detector to select snapshots based on scene changes in video stream) in order to select the best/ most appropriate snapshot to balance image quality with available resources (see also Toklu's abstract, 1st five lines).

11. Claims 65, 66, 68, 69, 71, and 72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Florin in view of Freach, in further view of Miller, USPN 6,597,358 (hereinafter "Miller").

11.1. Claim 65 differs from claim 1 in that **said displaying comprises displaying a plurality of graphical representations of polyhedrons** in the individual image areas in the electronic programming guide. The system of Florin and Freach is not explicit on displaying multiple polyhedrons (for example, Freach only shows one polyhedron in Fig. 2).

However, Miller discloses a user interface enabled to show multiple polyhedrons (Fig. 7) each with its own unique applications renderings (Col. 7, lines 13- 45).



Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the system of Florin and Freach with Miller's invention in order to provide the viewer with the convenience/ choice of multiple three dimensional representation of desired commands/ movies.

11.1.1. Claim 66 is rejected by the same analysis as claim 1, as we shown how various channels/ programming/ applications are mapped to various sides of the polyhedron.

11.2. Claim 68 differs from claim 17 in that **said displaying comprises displaying a plurality of graphical representations of polyhedrons** in the individual image areas in the electronic programming guide. The system of Florin and Freach is not explicit on displaying multiple polyhedrons (for example, Freach only shows one polyhedron in Fig. 2).

However, Miller discloses a user interface enabled to show multiple polyhedrons (Fig. 7) each with its own unique applications renderings (Col. 7, lines 13- 45).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the system of Florin and Freach with Miller's invention

in order to provide the viewer with the convenience/ choice of multiple three dimensional representation of desired commands/ movies.

11.2.1. Claim 69 is rejected by the same analysis as claim 17, as we shown how various channels/ programming/ applications are mapped to various sides of the polyhedron.

11.3. Claim 71 differs from claim 31 in that **said displaying comprises displaying a plurality of graphical representations of polyhedrons** in the individual image areas in the electronic programming guide. The system of Florin and Freach is not explicit on displaying multiple polyhedrons (for example, Freach only shows one polyhedron in Fig. 2).

However, Miller discloses a user interface enabled to show multiple polyhedrons (Fig. 7) each with its own unique applications renderings (Col. 7, lines 13- 45).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the system of Florin and Freach with Miller's invention in order to provide the viewer with the convenience/ choice of multiple three dimensional representation of desired commands/ movies.

Art Unit: 2421

11.3.1. Claim 72 is rejected by the same analysis as claim 31, as we shown how various channels/ programming/ applications are mapped to various sides of the polyhedron.

12. Claims 67, and 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Florin in view of Freach, in further view of Hsieh et al., USPN 5,883,640 (hereinafter "Hsieh").

12.1. Regarding claim 67, the system of Florin and Freach is silent on **using a graphics accelerator** to map the reduced thumbnail videos to the side of the graphical representation of the polyhedron.

However, Hsieh discloses using graphics accelerators to implement computational intensive tasks such as rendering blits, polygons, text rasterization (Col. 1, lines 35- 46).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the system of Florin and Freach with Hsieh's invention in order to improve system performance and response time.

12.2. Claim 70 is rejected by the same analysis as claim 67.

### ***Conclusion***

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

13.1. Yeo et al., USPN 6,870,573, further discloses receiving streams of video content, capturing frames, and producing a mosaic of low resolution real time representation of said channels as selected by the viewer. See Abstract, Figs. 4, 5, and 9

### ***Contacts***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JAMES R. MARANDI whose telephone number is (571)270-1843. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM- 5:00 PM M-F, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Miller can be reached on (571) 272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2421

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John W. Miller/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2421

/James R. Marandi/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2421